

WASHINGTON.
THE SENATE AND THE GEORGIA BILL.

A Stormy Radical Caucus.

WASHINGTON, March 10.
The Republican senators caucused an hour over Georgia. Bingham's amendment was the topic. A vote was not reached. The caucus seemed about equally divided, and unless there is further action in caucus, the bill as it came from the House, supported by the Democratic senators, will certainly pass. Morton, Drake, Thayer and Cameron spoke against it. Trumbull, Edmunds, Ferry and others spoke in favor of Bingham's amendment.

In the Senate Summer objected to the present consideration of the amendment to the rules for the consideration of treaties acquiring territory, in open session.

A petition was presented from the citizens of Mississippi for the abolition of the franking privilege.

The consideration of the Funding bill was resumed.

Official documents from General Reynolds, announcing the adoption of the amendments by Texas, were laid before the Senate.

The Senate is in session to-night on the Funding bill.

In the House, the air-line road was postponed to Tuesday.

The consideration of the bill reducing the army officers was resumed, and, after various amendments, passed.

LATER.—The caucus was so equally divided that both parties are afraid to call a vote on Bingham's amendment to the Georgia bill. A motion to adjourn to-morrow was defeated. A motion to adjourn sine die was carried.

A close poll of the Senate shows ten majority for Bingham's amendment, and unless another caucus is called, the adoption of the bill as it came from the House is regarded certain.

The feeling in caucus was quite bitter, and should another caucus be called, it is likely the friends of Bingham's amendment would remain away.

A negro delegation from Tennessee called on the President with a memorial for protection against outbreaks. Six Congressmen accompanied them.

EUROPE.

The Irish Land Bill.

LONDON, March 8.
In the House of Commons, to-night, debate on the Irish land bill continued. Mr. Maguire attacked the measure, declaring it fell short of the exalted expectations of the Irish people. Leases should be protected and made transferable. Politically the Irish tenantry were dangerous; personally they were models of virtue. He advocated the repeal of the law of distraint, and concluded by expressing the opinion that the bill, if properly amended, would prove a benefit to the country.

Mr. G. W. Hunt rejoiced at the good temper shown in the discussion, and commented at length on the provisions of the bill, approving of some and censuring others. He thought the defects might be remedied in the committee.

The Attorney General made an elaborate reply to these objections.

Mr. O'Donoghue thought the task undertaken was really the reorganization of the social system of Ireland. There was one hopeful augury in the fact that his voice, hitherto unheeded, was now heard.

Mr. Barry, in a speech full of humor and force, showed that the tenure system of England favored the tenant, while that of Ireland favored the landlord. This inequality, he said, needed redress, an opportunity for which this bill afforded. Celts and Protestants fled to America, bearing rancorous hatred toward England. From them came the possibility of war with America. He then proceeded to defend the bill in detail. After further debate the House adjourned.

Conservative Banquet.

LONDON, March 9.
The conservative banquet was largely attended by eminent men. A number of letters were read. The policy of the present government was condemned by all Sir James Pakenham, speaking of the army, said: "To disconnect the army and reduce its force by 24,600 men was injudicious economy. It was easier to dissolve than reemploy the army. Happily the country had another force, indestructible, armed with truth, namely—the Conservative party, which was enlisted to defend long-established institutions, not excepting the Irish Church."

Cheap Ocean Telegraphy.

LONDON, March 10.
The Times' money article suggests the experiment for a month, of five shillings for the west messages over the cables.

Affairs in Paris.

PARIS, March 10.
It is reported that smallpox prevails among the political prisoners.

Rochefort is sick.

The bullion in the Bank of France has increased over thirteen million francs.

THE OLD DOMINION.

RICHMOND, March 10.
The Legislature passed the homestead exemption bill, exempting two thousand dollars in property from taxation; also a bill requiring office-holders to take oath to support the State and Federal Constitutions.

The Virginia Horticultural Society was reorganized to-day, being the first meeting since the war. Hugh Blair Grigsby, president, and Thomas H. Wynne, secretary.

ITEMS FROM CUBA.

HAVANA, March 9.
A military court-martial convicted and sentenced to death several parties now in New York, implicated in the Villa Nueva riot last year.

The insurgents attacked a plantation near Santiago de Cuba, killing six operatives.

The Freemasons recently arrested for holding meetings are still in prison.

The musical enthusiasts on the Pacific coast have had a peace jubilee, at San Francisco, on a grand scale, beginning on the 22d of February and continuing through that and the two following days. The preparations and rehearsals furnished the chief subjects for conversation during the month preceding the event. Thirty-day hundred persons took part in the festival, including several military bands. Nor were the usual accompaniments of such festive waiting, artillery, brass, and chimes, anvils, and cannon were fired from the stand of the leader by the use of electricity, under the supervision of the Western Union Telegraph Company. An organ, and a drum eight feet in diameter, were made for the occasion. The children of the public schools had a week's holiday. The banks and leading business houses were closed on the first, and partially on the following days. The originator of the affair was the favorite California girl, who also bore on her feminine shoulders the burden of its organization, and is just now, as may well be believed, more admired than ever.

COLUMBIA.
THE STATE MEDICAL CONVENTION.

Second Day—Election of Officers—Adjournment.

(SPECIAL TELEGRAM TO THE NEWS.)

COLUMBIA, March 10.
The State Medical Convention, which convened here yesterday, adjourned to-day to meet in Charleston on the first Wednesday in April, 1870. The following officers were elected for the ensuing year: Dr. Robertson, president; Dr. Fair, first, Dr. Kinloch, second, and Dr. Wardlaw, third vice-presidents. The other officers, secretary, treasurer, &c., were re-elected. Interesting and instructive papers were submitted by Drs. Darby, Fair, Kinloch, Porcher and Gibbes.

FROM THE STATE CAPITAL.

Meeting of the State Medical Association—President's Address—Dr. Darby's Paper on Hair Sutures—The Canal—Delays Again.

COLUMBIA, March 9.
The Medical Association of South Carolina met to-day in annual session, the president, Dr. A. N. Tulley, of Columbia, in the chair. Charleston was represented by Drs. F. Peyre Porcher, R. A. Kinloch, F. L. Parker and J. Somers Buis.

The delegates from Columbia were Drs. Fair, Trezevant and Taylor. There were also present several resident physicians.

The meeting was held in the hall of Nickerson's Hotel. The number of physicians present was about twenty. The most noted, besides those already mentioned, were Dr. Darby, of Columbia, and Dr. Robertson, of Winnsboro'. The venerable Dr. Douglass, of Chester, sent a letter regretting his detention at home by feeble health, stating that he had some papers which he had purposed to submit to the meeting. His letter was referred to the Committee on Publication.

The regular address of President Tulley was among the earliest points of importance. It was carefully prepared and strongly professional, dealing earnest and able blows at the enemies of the profession, such as innovations, isms, and new fangled dogmas generally. The address was in elegant degree ex-cathedra, in both the borrowed and the literal sense.

Dr. John T. Darby, of the University, read a full and able paper on "Hair Sutures," comparing them with the thread, wire, and other means of sewing wounds, aptly illustrated with drawings and photographs, and accompanied with professional notes.

The meeting excites little attention outside of the profession, and is not so fully attended by members and delegates from abroad as was hoped and desired.

Adjourned until to-morrow at 11 A. M.

THE CANAL.

Senator Sprague's agent, Colonel Pearce, empowered his sub-agent, Mr. Hoyt, to commence work on the famous Columbia Canal just before the first of March. Mr. Hoyt took five negroes with hand shovels, and they shovelled for two days, when the work was again suspended. Now we are told that there must be some delay, in order to get on the necessary tools to complete the job of widening the canal. Colonel Pearce remained here several days. A few weeks will show whether this work is to go on honestly, or this second grand Sprague movement is a sham. This I know officially, that Senator Sprague's agent refused to give any bonds at all, and now stands up to a dollar's forfeit, except the nominal sum of \$200 paid for the job.

WAR'S WRINKLED FRONT.

The President's Father Again on his Muzzle—You Dirty Rebel Democrat, What Did You Do That For?—Effect of the Senate's Confirmation—Who Shaves Jesse Grant's Clerks?

(From the Cincinnati Commercial.)
About three days before Jesse R. Grant left for Washington to see about his confirmation as postmaster of Covington, and various other important matters concerning the offices in this vicinity, including the Newport postmaster, Mr. John Marshall, a well-known business man of Covington, at present residing in this city for several reasons, having been of Cincinnati, addressed a letter to Senator Drake, at the capital, in reference to the Covington postoffice. The letter was very short. It merely stated that out of the thirty thousand people who composed the population of that city, not more than thirty (and they all office-holders or office-seekers) desired Jesse R. Grant to be postmaster of that place; that, in behalf of the people of Covington, he protested against the confirmation of the Senate of Grant. Grant and hoped Senator Drake would use his influence to have him rejected.

Father Grant had not been in Washington an hour until this epistle was placed in his hands by some one who was very very wroth. He howled that if ever he got back to Covington he would thrash the writer of it. Jesse has been at home about a week, keeping quiet until news of his confirmation was received. The glad tidings came on Wednesday, and on Thursday he set forth to hunt up John Marshall. Meeting on Madison street his old friend Squire A. J. Francis—the "Squire" is one of the old friends of the family that has never been separated from him—he inquired where Mr. Marshall lived. The jolly magistrate directed him to the corner of Eighth and Scott; but in a moment seeing the object of his search on the opposite side of the street, escorted him over and introduced him to Mr. Marshall in front of the latter's store. The following highly interesting conversation then took place, Squire Francis having modestly retired:

Mr. Grant. Are you the Marshall that wrote a letter to Senator Drake about me?

Mr. Marshall. (smiling.) I wrote a letter some time ago to Senator Drake, protesting against your confirmation as postmaster at Covington.

Mr. Grant. (earnest and excited, and clutching his cane.) You dirty rebel Democrat, what did you do that for?

Mr. Marshall. I suppose you would like to have the place yourself?

Mr. Grant. I should not object to it.

Mr. Marshall. I have saved to the government, since I have been postmaster at Covington, \$5000.

Mr. Grant. And you think I am not fit for postmaster of Covington?

Mr. Marshall. I said nothing in my letter about your fitness or unfitness for the position; but you well know, Mr. Grant, that a very small number of people in this city desire to see you in the place of the incumbent.

Mr. Grant. I suppose you would like to have the place yourself?

Mr. Marshall. I should not object to it.

Mr. Grant. I have saved to the government, since I have been postmaster at Covington, \$5000.

Mr. Grant. And you think I am not fit for postmaster of Covington?

Mr. Marshall. I said nothing in my letter about your fitness or unfitness for the position; but you well know, Mr. Grant, that a very small number of people in this city desire to see you in the place of the incumbent.

Mr. Grant. I suppose you would like to have the place yourself?

Mr. Marshall. I should not object to it.

Mr. Grant. I have saved to the government, since I have been postmaster at Covington, \$5000.

Mr. Grant. And you think I am not fit for postmaster of Covington?

Mr. Marshall. I said nothing in my letter about your fitness or unfitness for the position; but you well know, Mr. Grant, that a very small number of people in this city desire to see you in the place of the incumbent.

Mr. Grant. I suppose you would like to have the place yourself?

Mr. Marshall. I should not object to it.

Mr. Grant. I have saved to the government, since I have been postmaster at Covington, \$5000.

Mr. Grant. And you think I am not fit for postmaster of Covington?

Mr. Marshall. I said nothing in my letter about your fitness or unfitness for the position; but you well know, Mr. Grant, that a very small number of people in this city desire to see you in the place of the incumbent.

Mr. Grant. I suppose you would like to have the place yourself?

Mr. Marshall. I should not object to it.

Mr. Grant. I have saved to the government, since I have been postmaster at Covington, \$5000.

Mr. Grant. And you think I am not fit for postmaster of Covington?

Mr. Marshall. I said nothing in my letter about your fitness or unfitness for the position; but you well know, Mr. Grant, that a very small number of people in this city desire to see you in the place of the incumbent.

Mr. Grant. I suppose you would like to have the place yourself?

THE NEW REGIME.
The Lights of the Legislature.

NUMBER V.

ADAMSON, ROSEMAN, AND OTHERS.

W. Adamson is a black man, and represents Kershaw County, if sitting in his seat and voting as he is told can be called representing. Benjamin A. Roseman is of mixed blood, quite intelligent, is the physician of the Charleston County jail, and regent of the Lunatic Asylum. He represents Charleston County, does not speak often, and has little influence. B. F. Berry is a white man, by profession a clergyman, and represents Barnwell County. J. A. Bowley is a black man, and represents Georgetown County. He aspires to be a leader of the House, and imitates DeLorge, Elliott and Whipper, but received for his pains hisses and laughter, instead of the applause he desired and thought he deserved. He is school commissioner of Georgetown County. Wm. J. Brodie is a black man, and represents Charleston County, as also does Stephen Brown, who is a black man. Neither of them are of much service to their constituents. Barney Burton, John and Joseph Boston are black men, and represent respectively the counties of Chester, Darlington and Newberry, and may be classed among the silent members. John A. Boswell is a white man, and a representative from Kershaw County. He is postmaster at Camden, and, as a correspondent informs us, has a colored woman for his wife. W. A. Bishop is a white man, representing Spartanburg County. Like Boswell, he was not "called" to be a legislator. Lawrence Cain is a mulatto and E. J. Cain a black man, representing respectively the counties of Edgefield and Orangeburg, in which they hold the offices of school commissioner. They, and Wilson Cooke, of mixed blood, and representing Greenville County, and Wm. S. Collins, a white man, representing Marion County, fill chairs in the House, and are of no further legislative service. The Marston also accuses Collins of having sold his vote on the Phosphate bill, for one hundred and twenty-five dollars.

JOSEPH CREWS.
The first thing to be said of Joseph is that he was chairman of the committee appointed to investigate the "disordered state of affairs" in the Third Congressional District. The report of the committee shows the manner of man he is. As a legislator he is not worth much to his constituents of Laurens County, which he represented, but was very useful to the members of the Legislature, to whom he loaned money at a high rate of percentage. Joseph is a native of North Carolina, and is a "man of peace." Joseph is very popular with the State officials, and it is generally believed does all of the secret work that is done by these officials.

DE LARGÉ.
Robert C. DeLargé is a little fellow, of mixed blood, a representative of Charleston County, and the leader of the House, having more influence in it, perhaps, than all three of the other influential representatives, viz: Elliott, Moses and Whipper. DeLargé is not educated, but is shrewd, a ready adapter, tricky and full of energy. He is as restless as a June-bug, and it is as difficult to keep an eye upon him as it was for the Dutchman to put his finger on the flea. He seldom sits in his seat, but moves all about the House, chatting to this or that representative; making *sotto voce* remarks, and a least once in every ten minutes addressing the House. It is difficult to assign a reason for his influence, but it is almost unbounded. No measure that he puts forward stops on its way to an act in the House; the "wheels of legislation" in the House seemed to be moved, for him, by clock-work, of which he alone has the key. He has a thorough contempt for a large number of his associates, and abuses them roundly whenever he feels in the humor. He is now Land Commissioner.

DENNIS, DRIFLE, DUVALL, DEMARS.
John B. Dennis, who rejoices in the prefix of "General," was an officer in the United States army during the late war, and is now a representative from Charleston County. He is employed in one of the State departments. He was frequently absent last session, spoke little, and has no influence. Wm. Drifflé, a large, bright mulatto, is representative from Colleton County. Because of his good humor and frequent laughing he is called "laughing Drifflé," and "motion Drifflé," because he makes so many motions. Lewis W. Duvall is a white man, a representative and sheriff of Fairfield County, with no influence whatever. Francis Demars is one of the most respectable Radical representatives in the House, and appeared to be thoroughly disgusted with the company he was in. He represents Orangeburg County, and is postmaster at the county seat.

ELLIOTT.
or "Colonel" R. D. Elliott as he is designated, because of his position as assistant adjutant-general of the State, is a black man and represents Barnwell County. He makes the best sounding speeches in the House, but there is little in what he says. His influence is next to that of DeLargé's. The only way to compare the two is to liken them to a fox and a bull. Like the bull, Elliott goes roaring along with head down, seeing neither to the right nor to the left. If an obstacle present itself and he cannot break it down with a rush, he gives up. DeLargé will go tripping up over it, or through it, or under it, and will run up and down until he can get around it. Elliott has gained considerable notoriety by horsewhipping a low white man in Columbia last summer. He is a native of the North, and by profession a lawyer.

THE WOMAN MOVEMENT.
The Female Grand Jury in Wyoming—Their Right to Serve Sustained—Address of Judge Dove.

A dispatch from Laramie City, Wyoming Territory, dated on Monday last, says:

The Judiciary of Wyoming sustain the right of women to serve as grand jurors. All the ladies drawn as grand jurors were present this morning at 11 o'clock this morning. A motion was made to quash the panel, but it was not sustained. At five minutes to 12 o'clock the first panel of lady grand jurors in the world were sworn. None of them asked to be excused. An able address was delivered by Chief Justice Dove. He said:

"Ladies and Gentlemen of the Grand Jury—It is an innovation and a great novelty to see, as we do to-day, ladies summoned to serve as jurors. The extension of political rights and franchise to women is a subject that is agitating the whole country. I have never taken an active part in these discussions, but I have long seen that woman was a victim to the vices, crimes and immoralities of man with no power to protect and defend herself from these evils. I have long felt that such powers of protection should be conferred upon woman, and it has fallen to our lot here to act as the pioneer in the movement, and to test the question. The eyes of the whole world are to-day fixed upon this jury of Albany County. There is not the slightest impropriety in any lady occupying this position, and I wish to assure you that the fullest protection of the court shall be accorded to you."

But, even more than on the assistance of these powers, that success was to depend on its security. There were two classes by whom it might be discovered—the ministers, servants, confidential friends of the Emperor, and the general public. It was plainly impossible to conceal it from the ministers, &c. So they were taken into confidence, and promised great honors under the government as the reward of their secrecy. Thus the fidelity of these men to the cause of the Imperial family, or in their self interest, were their scheme secured. It was not until the Emperor, from the general public was more difficult.

To do this, there was a dummy needed, who on the few occasions on which the supposed Emperor would appear in public was to represent him. By this means the Emperor, by the aid of his dummy, could be seen by the public, and the Emperor, by the aid of his dummy, could be seen by the public, and the Emperor, by the aid of his dummy, could be seen by the public.

It was a rumor circulating here so strange as to seem almost incredible—one which it would be impossible to keep from the newspapers, that the Emperor, as well as the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day after day to General Prim and others, to whom a knowledge of the death of the Emperor was known. Efforts were made to mould public opinion, both in France and England, in the interests of the Emperor and a regency. Thus the London Times, of September 11, wrote substantially that it was the Emperor, who was Emperor or regent if personal government were abandoned, that the real question was who was minister. Finally, to satisfy the public that the Emperor's will was restored, the Emperor, who really were friendly to the plan, had been discovered. On the other hand, audiences were refused day